

## REMARKS

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are requested.

The examiner's rejection of claims 1, 5-7, 10-12, 15-18, 21-23, 27, 28, and 31 as being "anticipated", under 35 USC 102, is respectfully traversed. The examiner has rejected these claims as being unpatentable over Kajita (US 4,954,913). Claims 5-7 depend from claim 1, claims 12 and 15-16 depend from claim 11, claims 18 and 21 depend from claim 17, and claims 23 and 27 depend from claim 22.

Apparatus claim 1 requires a flatbed-scanner scan bar 12 movable along a subscan axis 20, requires first and second scan-bar homing references 14 and 16 spaced apart along the subscan axis 20, and requires an image placement area 18 disposed between the first and second scan-bar homing references 14 and 16.

Kajita discloses a flatbed-scanner scan head 7 movable along rail 10 in a main scan direction A, wherein rail 10 is movable along rails 16 and 17 in a sub-scan direction B (see fig. 1 of Kajita). Some flatbed scanners have a scan bar and other flatbed scanners have a scan head. The terminology "scan bar" to those of ordinary skill in the art means a bar having hundreds or thousands of image sensors (such as, but not limited to, CCDs) which span the width of the scan area (see paragraph [0014] of the specification). A scan bar does not physically move in the main scan direction. Instead, the array of image sensors which span the width of the scan area are read. After such reading, the scan bar is moved in the subscan direction for another reading of the "scan-area-width-spanning" image sensors. In contrast, the terminology "scan head" (such as scan head 7 of Kajita) to those of ordinary skill in the art means an image sensor unit which physically moves and simultaneously reads in the main scan direction across the width of the scan area and then is moved in the subscan direction (see figure 1 of Kajita). It is clear that Kajita describes a scan head and does not teach, suggest or describe a scan bar as required by applicants' claim 1.

The examiner alleges that Kajita teaches a first scan-bar homing reference and a second scan-bar homing reference spaced apart along the subscan axis from the first scan-bar homing

reference. Applicants respectfully disagree. First, Kajita teaches a scan head and not a scan bar as previously discussed. Second, the examiner has not identified what is the first and second scan-bar homing references in Kajita. Perhaps the examiner is referring to figure 2 of Kajita which shows HP as a home position and BP as a back position. However, HP and BP are spaced apart along the main scan axis (note that the main scan direction is indicated at the top of figure 2 as a horizontal line and that HP and BP are horizontally spaced apart in figure 2). HP and BP of Kajita are not spaced apart along the subscan axis as required by applicants' claim 1.

Method claims 10, 11, 17, 22, 28, and 31 require obtaining a scanner which, like the scanner of claim 1, includes a flatbed-scanner scan bar 12 movable along a subscan axis 20, first and second scan-bar homing references 14 and 16 spaced apart along the subscan axis 20, and an image placement area 18 disposed between the first and second scan-bar homing references 14 and 16, and applicants' previous remarks concerning the patentability of claim 1 over Kajita are herein incorporated by reference.

Method claims 10, 11, 17, 22, 28, and 31 basically also require performing a prescan or an image scan by moving the scan bar along the subscan axis from the first scan-bar homing reference in relation to the image and performing a prescan or an image scan of the image or of an additional image by moving the scan bar along the subscan axis from the second scan-bar homing reference in relation to the image or the additional image. The scan head of Kajita only reads when it is moving from right to left along the main scan direction as shown in figure 2. The scan head of Kajita does not read when it is moving back from left to right along the main scan direction while simultaneously being advanced along the sub scan direction (note the diagonal line return path of the scan head in figure 2). Thus, Kajita does not perform a prescan or an image scan by moving the scan bar along the subscan axis from the first scan-bar homing reference in relation to the image and performing a prescan or an image scan of the image or of an additional image by moving the scan bar along the subscan axis from the second scan-bar homing reference in relation to the image or the additional image as required by claims 10, 11, 17, 22, 28, and 31.

The examiner's rejection of claims 2-4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 19, 20, 24-26, 29, 30, 32, and 33 as being "obvious", under 35 USC 103, is respectfully traversed. The examiner has rejected these claims as being unpatentable over Kajita (US 4,954,913) in view of Hsu (US 7,259,896). Claims 2-4 and 8-9 depend from claim 1, claims 13-14 depend from claim 11, claims 19-20 depend from claim 17, claims 24-26 depend from claim 22, claims 29-30 depend from claim 28, claims 32-33 depend from claim 31, and applicants' previous remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1, 11, 17, 22, 28, and 31 are herein incorporated by reference.

Hsu teaches a scanner having an automatic document feeder (ADF) 4 and an optical module 33. The optical module 33 moves from a homing reference where it is aligned with a home pattern 44 having both positioning and calibrating functions to a home location (reading position) where it is aligned to read the document which moves past the optical module 33. Hsu teaches only one homing reference, whereas, as previously discussed, claims 1, 11, 17, 22, 28, and 31 require two homing references spaced apart along the subscan axis. The optical module 33 of Hsu is stationary with respect to the homing pattern 44 when the optical module 33 is reading the document (see column 3, lines 8-11), whereas, as previously discussed, claims 11, 17, 22, 28, and 31 basically require performing a prescan or an image scan by moving the scan bar along the subscan axis from the first scan-bar homing reference in relation to the image and performing a prescan or an image scan of the image or of an additional image by moving the scan bar along the subscan axis from the second scan-bar homing reference in relation to the image or the additional image. It is clear that Kajita and Hsu, taken alone or in combination including obvious modifications thereof, do not teach, suggest or describe the subject matter of applicants' claims.

Inasmuch as each of the rejections has been answered by the above remarks, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that this application be passed to issue.

Serial No.: 10/754,125  
Attorney Docket No.: 2003-0140.01  
Amendment

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas E. Erickson

Douglas E. Erickson

Reg. No. 29,530

Date: 1/16/08

THOMPSON HINE LLP  
2000 Courthouse Plaza NE  
10 West Second Street  
Dayton, Ohio 45402-1758  
(937) 443-6814